Claims 9, 17, and 22 are amended. Claims 1-8, 15-16, and 24-32 have previously been withdrawn. Claims 9-14 and 17-23 are thus pending and listed below. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that this application be allowed and forwarded on to issuance.

§102 Rejections

Claims 9-11, 13-14, 17-19 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0177388 to Botz et al. (hereinafter, "Botz"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Nevertheless, Applicant has amended the claim for the sole purpose of advancing prosecution and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections.

Claim 9, as amended, recites a method comprising:

- receiving a credential from a user at an input device in communication with a local machine having an OS, the local machine capable of being in communication with a plurality of different input devices each configured to enable the user to log on with the OS to access the local machine;
- translating the credential with one of a plurality of different coexisting credential provider modules for translating respectively different types of credentials into a common credential protocol, the plurality of different coexisting credential provider modules also enabling the user to log on with the OS to access the local machine with each corresponding different input device that is in communication with local machine;
- using a component of the OS to authenticate the translated credential having the common credential protocol against a credential database; and
- logging the user on with the OS to access the local machine when the authentication is successful.

Applicant respectfully submits that Botz fails to disclose Applicant's amended claim 9. For instance, Applicant respectfully submits that Botz at least fails to disclose "a plurality of different input devices each configured to enable the user to log on with the OS to access the local machine", as recited in Applicant's claim. Botz similarly fails to disclose a "plurality of different coexisting credential provider modules also enabling the user to log on with the OS to access the local machine with each corresponding different input device that is in communication with local machine". Applicant notes that the Office agreed during the afore-mentioned interview that Botz discloses no such claim elements. Applicant once again thanks the Office for its insight.

For at least these reasons, this claim stands allowable.

Claims 10-11 and 13-14 depend from claim 9 and, by virtue of this dependency, the above comments directed to claim 9 apply equally to these claims. Moreover, these claims recite features that, when taken together with those of claim 9, define methods not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 17 recites a method comprising:

- receiving a credential from a user at an input device in communication with a local machine having an OS, the local machine capable of being in communication with a plurality of different input devices, each capable of receiving a credential from the user to enable the user to log on to access the local machine with the OS;
- translating the credential with a credential provider module that corresponds to the input device, wherein:
  - o the credential provider module is one of a plurality of coexisting different said credential provider modules; and
  - o each said credential provider module can perform a translation of a respectively different type of said credential received at a different said input device in communication with the local machine; and

- o each said translation of each said credential is in a common credential protocol;
- communicating the translated credential having the common credential protocol through a credential provider interface to a logon UI routine of the OS;
- passing the translated credential having the common credential protocol to a logon routine of the OS from the logon UI routine;
- authenticating the translated credential against a credential database with the logon routine of the OS; and
- logging the user on to access the local machine with the OS when the authentication is successful.

Applicant respectfully submits that Botz fails to disclose Applicant's amended claim 17. For instance, Applicant respectfully submits that Botz at least fails to disclose a "local machine [that is] capable of being in communication with a plurality of different input devices, each capable of receiving a credential from the user to enable the user to log on to access the local machine with the OS", as recited in Applicant's claim. Applicant notes that the Office agreed during the afore-mentioned interview that Botz discloses no such claim element. Applicant once again thanks the Office for its insight.

For at least these reasons, this claim stands allowable.

Claims 18-19 and 21 depend from claim 17 and, by virtue of this dependency, the above comments directed to claim 17 apply equally to these claims. Moreover, these claims recite features that, when taken together with those of claim 17, define methods not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 22 recites a computer-readable medium comprising a credential provider module including instructions that, when executed by a local machine having an operating system (OS), receive and translate a credential into a credential protocol so as to be compatible for authentication by an authentication component of the OS against a credential database for logging a user identified by

the credential on with the OS to access the local machine when the authentication is successful, wherein:

- the translated credential can be received via an interface to the authentication component of the OS;
- the interface to the authentication component of the OS is compatible for receiving each of a plurality of said credentials from a corresponding plurality of different coexisting credential provider modules; and
- each said different coexisting credential provider module can:
  - receive a respective different type of said credential from a respective input device, each respective input device capable of coupling to the local machine and enabling the user to log on with the OS to access the local machine; and
  - translate each said different type of said credential into the credential protocol so as to be compatible for authentication by the authentication component of the OS against the credential database.

Applicant respectfully submits that Botz fails to disclose Applicant's amended claim 17. For instance, Applicant respectfully submits that Botz at least fails to disclose "receiv[ing] a respective different type of said credential from a respective input device, each respective input device capable of coupling to the local machine and enabling the user to log on with the OS to access the local machine", as recited in Applicant's claim. Applicant notes that the Office agreed during the afore-mentioned interview that Botz discloses no such claim element. Applicant once again thanks the Office for its insight.

For at least these reasons, this claim stands allowable.

§103 Rejections

Claims 12, 20 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Botz in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0139355 to Axel et al. (hereinafter, "Axel"). Applicant also respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 12, 20, and 23 depend from claims 9, 17, and 22, respectively. Applicant respectfully submits that Axel does not serve to cure the deficiencies in the rejections of these base claims. Thus, each of claims 12, 20 and 23 are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claims 9, 17, and 22, define methods and devices that are not disclosed, taught or suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2007/03/05   By: _____

Robert G. Hartman
Reg. No. 58,970
(509) 324-9256 ext 265